

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the above-referenced application are respectfully requested.

Initially, the indication that Claims 12-27 and 43-49 are allowed is appreciatively noted. The indication that Claims 10 and 11 are objected to but would be allowable if rewritten into independent form is also appreciatively noted. These claims are retained herein.

Claims 2-9 stand rejected under 35 USC 103 as allegedly being unpatentable over Corcoran in view of Poradish et al. This contention is respectfully traversed.

Claim 2 requires an optical train with in focus and out of focus locations. Claim 2 ALSO requires a first color changing element allowing the color of the light to be changed at a first in focus location, and the second color changing element allowing the color of the light to be changed at a first out of focus location. That is, the color must be changed at both of in focus and out of focus locations.

The rejection apparently admits that Corcoran does not have two color changing elements, one of them in focus and the other at an out of focus location. This is true - since the two color devices of Corcoran do exactly the same thing, and therefore must be in precisely the same optical configuration. The

rejection states that these wheels are both in the out of focus location, and this is presumably true.

The rejection sites the secondary reference to Poradish et al. apparently shows a path that has both in focus and out of focus locations. While the path has both such locations, it does not teach using those locations for color changing.

However, rather than Poradish et al. teaching that light should be colored at both the in focus and out of focus locations, Poradish et al. teaches that all light is colored at an in focus location. See column 3 lines 22-23 which explain that the light is focused on the color wheel. See also the bottom line in column 3 which explains that the light is focused on the color wheel. That is, Poradish et al. teaches that light should be colored only at an in focus location.

No fair combination of Corcoran in view of Poradish et al. would teach coloring light at both an in focus and an out of focus location. The Corcoran system already colors the light at the out of focus location, and teaches nothing which would suggest one having ordinary skill in the art of light should be additionally colored at some other location.

Similarly, Poradish's teaching is very clear: all light in the Poradish et al. system is colored at the focus location. There is no teaching or suggestion of additionally coloring the light at an unfocused location. The rejection relies on the

fact that Poradish et al., like very many other optical trains, have both in focus and out of focus locations. However, there is no teaching or suggestion of coloring the light at both in focus and out of focus locations. Therefore, Claim 2 should be allowable for these reasons along with the claims that depend therefrom.

The dependent claims should be allowable for additional reasons. Claim 4, for example, specifies that the color changer is a color cross-fader. This makes no sense in the context of either Corcoran or Poradish et al. Corcoran is a picture phone, it would never need to cross fade between colors. Similarly, Poradish et al. is a video screen, which would never need to cross fade between colors. In any case, neither of these references specifically teaches a cross fade.

Claim 6 defines that each of the color changing elements includes clear portions. This makes no sense in the context of the color wheel of Corcoran. If the color wheel of Corcoran were modified to have a clear portion, that hypothetically-modified color wheel would not operate. Therefore, any proposed modification to add a clear portion would defeat the ability of Corcoran to carry out its intended function.

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed in this paper. However, failure to address a specific rejection, issue or comment, does not signify agreement with or

concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above are not intended to be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

Applicants ask that all claims be allowed. Please apply the \$60 one month extension of time fee, and any other applicable charges or credits, to Deposit Account No. 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: September 18, 2006

/Scott Harris/

Scott C. Harris
Reg. No. 32,030

Fish & Richardson P.C.
PTO Customer No. 20985
12390 El Camino Real
San Diego, California 92130
(858) 678-5070 telephone
(858) 678-5099 facsimile

10666321.doc